## UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

IN RE: Case No. 08-35653(KRH)

CIRCUIT CITY STORES,

INC., 701 East Broad Street

Richmond, VA 23219

Debtors.

June 16, 2010

2:02 p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING BEFORE HONORABLE KEVIN R. HUENNEKENS UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

McGuire Woods, LLP For the Debtor:

> By: DOUGLAS M. FOLEY, ESQ. 9000 World Trade Center,

101 W. Main St. Norfolk, VA 23510

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES:

For the Debtor: Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom,

LLP

By: GREGG M. GALARDI, ESQ.

One Rodney Sq.

Wilmington, DE 19899

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

> J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. 268 Evergreen Avenue Hamilton, New Jersey 08619 E-mail: jjcourt@optonline.net

(609)586-2311 Fax No. (609) 587-3599

## TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES:

For the Creditors' Committee:

Pachulski, Stang, Ziehl & Jones, LLP By: JEFFREY N. POMERANTZ, ESQ.

2

10100 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 1100

Los Angeles, CA 90067

Pachulski, Stang, Ziehl & Jones, LLP

By: ROBERT J. FEINSTEIN, ESQ. 780 Third Avenue, 36th Floor

New York, NJ 10017

\_ \_ \_

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Court is now in session. Please 2 be seated and come to order.

COURT CLERK: In the matter of Circuit City Stores, Incorporated, hearing on Items 1 through 4 as set out on today's docket.

MR. FOLEY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Doug Foley with McGuire Woods on behalf of Circuit City. With me in court today is Katie Bradshaw who's the vice president and controller of the company. I also believe on the phone is our respective co-counsel, Mr. Galardi, as well as Mr. Tavenner's respective co-counsel, Rob Feinstein and Jeff Pomerantz. We're obviously available to answer any of the Court's questions with respect 13 to the matters that are on for status today.

We first want to thank the Court for obviously setting the hearing today. As Your Honor is aware from last week, there are some issues that happened with respect to the joint plan and the filing of the separate plan. The hearing today has certainly had the effect of all of the professionals -- and I can attest to this, working feverishly over the last four days to try to put the proverbial Humpty Dumpty back together again.

The parties have been exchanging documents and, in fact, are -- continue to do so. We've narrowed the issues to a handful of still very important issues. We're certainly not in complete agreement on all the issues yet, but we are hopeful

1 that with another week and being able to have these matters set 2 for hearing, including the mediation motion, as well as the professional retention motions, on for the omnibus hearing on 4 the 24th that we'd be able to report to the Court at that time what our conclusion is and our efforts to voluntarily and consensually resolve these matters without the need for third party mediation or tell the Court that we're prepared to go forward with that motion.

5 II

6

7

8

9

11

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

Just to give the Court a broad view of the issues that are -- that remain, there are certain issues relating to certain debtors and exculpation provisions with respect to 12 those debtors, as well as the construct and organization of the oversight committee that will oversee the liquidating trust post-confirmation, as well as certain structural issues with respect to some of the Canadian entities that remain open. If the Court has any specific questions or if any of the co-counsel that are on the phone would care to address the Court, then I'll defer to the Court on that.

Well, the question that I have is why THE COURT: shouldn't I order the mediation right now?

MR. FOLEY: Your -- if Your Honor is prepared to do that, we'll obviously live with that and proceed that way, but we think that we might be able to resolve the issues without the need to do that by the 24th.

THE COURT: Which is what you said last time and said

that the 16th would be enough. And I asked last time why the 2 16th and there was an expression of urgency among the various parties that they wanted to have this date, so the Court set this time aside so that we could do that. And what I see is that, you know, we haven't really made much progress from the last time we were here.

MR. POMERANTZ: Your Honor --

MR. GALARDI: Your Honor --

1

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

15

17 I

20

21

22

23

24

MR. POMERANTZ: -- Jeff Pomerantz, if I may add we agree with what Mr. Foley has said. And while it may appear to the Court that we're here asking for a continuance because not much has progressed, I can tell you that we have reached agreement on certain issues. We are moving forward and as Your Honor recalls, the mediation motion was filed by the debtor at a time when it did not look like the committee and the debtor could reach an agreement on its own. I think the filing of the mediation motion and each of the client's and professional's 18 response thereto, has resulted in an atmosphere where we are hopeful that a deal can be reached and that we still believe that trying to reach a deal among ourselves without third party mediation is the best course, is the quickest course, is the cheapest course and the way to get this plan confirmed as quickly as possible.

Now, it may be that we come back next week and we 25 tell Your Honor that despite our best efforts we were

1

5

7

10

11

12

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

unsuccessful and we need mediation. But, at least from the 2 committee's prospective, and I think it's shared by the debtor, that we would suggest that one additional continuance over the 4 next week to give the parties a last attempt understanding that it will be the last attempt because I think both sides are getting down to the point where we'll either settle or we will need mediation. So, we would request another eight days and believe that we have made progress and that hopefully we can get there without the additional time and cost of mediation.

MR. GALARDI: Your Honor, it's Gregg Galardi. Let me add to what Mr. Pomerantz and Mr. Foley have said and why mediation actually could be a step backwards at this point, although we've made the motion. As we promised Your Honor and suggested originally, we would work in good faith to do that, to resolve these issues. Part of the issues are, you know, revisions to a plan, a liquidating trust document, a confirmation order and bylaws. And there are lawyers that need to review those and look at those.

We think we've narrowed issues. But, if we were to have mediation now -- and I think the committee can respond if this is true, but I think what we have talked about is, since like any settlement you've come a long way to get very close, if we actually had mediation, we may open Pandora's box to a whole host of issues. It's not just one or two narrow issues that would be mediated. It would be how we got here and, you

1 know, all so those issues.

2

7

9

10

14

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

So, it would be our strong view that delaying it eight days to see if we can narrow those final issues to get to  $4 \parallel$  a settlement as opposed to mediation is better because if we go  $5 \parallel$  to mediation (1), it will be a delay and I think no one wants a delay (2), it may open up old wounds or issues that we hopefully are putting behind us as we get to an agreement. we, too, support just putting off our motion for those seven days.

7

But, again, if Your Honor wanted to order mediation, 11 $\parallel$  we understand that, but we actually think it could actually delay and open up issues that we hopefully are resolving as part of a whole package deal.

MR. POMERANTZ: And -- this is Jeff Pomerantz. would agree with what Mr. Galardi said. We are at a very sensitive part of the negotiations. We have come a long way. There are issues still to resolve, but I do agree that if we would go to mediation, I think both sides would review where they've been, and would start at a different place and it would be counter productive at this point. It may be necessary if we can't bridge our differences by next week, but at this point, we think the progress is moving sufficiently forward to warrant another eight days.

And I could assure Your Honor that if the committee 25∥didn't believe that the progress -- that progress was being

1 made, as you know we filed our plan because we were unhappy  $2 \parallel$  with the status quo and wanted to move the process. having said that given the events over the last two, three weeks, we think that the current circumstances merit an additional eight days.

5

6

7

8

9

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Pomerantz. Thank you, Mr. Galardi. Does any other party wish to be heard? (No audible response)

THE COURT: All right. The -- with some reluctance, 10∥ the Court is going to go ahead and exceed to the request of the debtors and the committee to grant the additional eight days to 12 the hearing that's presently scheduled for the 24th. been fully prepared to order the mediation today, but I'm going to give that eight days. I'm very concerned with the slippage of time and what's going on and -- but, I take at face value the progress that you report that you're making.

And, so I, obviously, respect counsel's views on that and accept that. So, with that, the Court will continue the -these matters over to the 24th. If we don't have things resolved by then, it's very, very likely that I will order the mediation at that point, but we'll take that up on that day.

MR. FOLEY: We appreciate that, Your Honor. We understand fully where the Court is coming from on that.

THE COURT: All right. Is there any other business 25 we need to take up today?

9